



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tunately not uncommon in the theses of our recent college graduates, and which may be due to the recent neglect of the study of the classics.

The only notable omission is the history of the Whiskey Ring. This is treated with unnecessary abbreviation. If adequately and judiciously set forth, it would have made the work less weary to the reader, and the author would have rendered an important service by showing how well founded were the charges made in contemporary publications and in the courts as to the implication of some of the highest and most influential officers in the United States in the conspiracy. He would have furnished valuable and interesting material for the histories of the cities of New York and St. Louis.

We can find no reference to the dispute as to the constitutionality of the cotton tax imposed during the Civil War, which was attacked as a duty upon exports; nor to the Treasury fee of four cents a pound charged for a license to buy cotton then in a state that had joined in the Confederacy and to transport the same into a loyal state. This, although in its effect similar to a tax and not imposed by Congress, was sustained by the Supreme Court in *Hamilton v. Dillon* (21 Wall. 73, 22 L. Ed. 528).

A few errors belong to a class not unusually found in the books of laymen who discuss judicial decisions. At page 35 the writer speaks of two cases brought before the courts, which he describes as the "Georgia Case" and the "Direct Tax Case". His citations are rulings of comptrollers of the Treasury. And he omits the case of *U. S. v. Louisiana* (123 U. S. 32), decided December 24, 1887, which is in harmony with one of these comptroller's rulings.

The citations of cases in the federal, district, and circuit courts, are usually from the *Internal Revenue Record*, a periodical which few libraries contain. Had he taken the trouble to add references to the regular reports and to the reprint entitled *Federal Cases*, the author by the use of a table of cases would have expended only a few more hours of labor and he would have saved his readers much time and needless irritation. A table of the cases cited in the book would also have increased its value.

His bibliography, although it mentions Boutwell's *Manual of the Direct and Excise Tax System of the United States*, together with Bump's *Internal Revenue Statutes now in Force*, omits Foster and Abbot on the income tax of 1894. This was the only volume published before 1913 that contained the text of all the statutes and a complete digest of the decisions of the courts and the rulings by the commissioner of internal revenue upon the income taxes of the Civil War.

Confederate Portraits. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xix, 291.)

HERE is a volume interesting and significant but for which the word "portraits" in the title claims too much. The claim becomes slightly pretentious through the coinage of a new term for what is done in these

essays—"psychography". The origination of a new type of expression is perhaps the rarest achievement of art and the claim to have done so inevitably challenges severe scrutiny.

Observe Mr. Bradford's method. First of all he deliberately repudiates consecutive narrative. There is no dramatic movement in his essays. The reader stands still and is bombarded by observations. One suspects that the method is based in the author's mind on a philosophical conception left over from a more metaphysical age, the conception of character not as a plastic thing forever in formation or destruction but as a predetermined substance contained in circumstance as in a vase. For people who hold such views the sequence of events is almost immaterial; what they want is a logical pattern conceived once for all with time omitted. Furthermore, Mr. Bradford makes a point of rejecting all debatable matter. Ask him whether Longstreet bungled Gettysburg and he replies, in substance, "Let us waive that; my notion of his character, from the things he said, and some of the things he did, and from what others thought of him, is so-and-so." All very well when the character involved is not problematical. Stuart, for example, will make a charming essay—as here he does—no matter what method is used nor how slight the circumstantial basis. Much the same might be said of the essays on Beauregard and Semmes. It is in the treatment of problematical subjects—in this case, J. E. Johnston, Longstreet, Benjamin, Stephens, Toombs—that the method of "psychography" meets its test. Is it better fitted than established methods to discover the strange harmony, if harmony there be, that, in such characters, underlies the discord?

A typical instance of the "psychographical" method is the essay on Stephens—who, by the way, in his several aspects, reminds us of Cicero, Voltaire, Leopardi, Amiel, even Plato, to say nothing of Byron and Galileo—and who is here pictured in a series of descriptions topically arranged without the least intimation that the sequence of his deeds is a necessary condition to relating properly his various sides. In fact, the method might be briefly described as an attempt to portray the characters of men without determining the sequence of their deeds.

One need not insist that history hitherto has not employed the psychographical method. What is more to the point, considering Mr. Bradford's general attitude, neither has literature. It is as far from Thackeray as from Gibbon. What would remain of the portrait of Mrs. Crawley if we subtracted from the causes of the effect all Thackeray's delicate care to have us perceive the exact deviation from the familiar in the curve of her conduct? It is because he has not learned this lesson that Mr. Bradford's work—pleasing as it is, and it is very pleasing—lacks force. Compare his best essay with, say, Matthew Arnold's "Falkland" or Pater's "Leonardo", and we realize that psychography is no improvement upon literature.

What then are the virtues of this volume? To begin with, the de-

lightful one of being readable—which too many books of history are not. Also its tone. In a way nothing could be more praiseworthy than the tone of cordial sympathy that pervades every essay. But the chief virtue is Mr. Bradford himself. He has a conviction, he feels it strongly and he communicates it—the conviction that personality as such, with all its inconsistencies, fanaticisms, illusions, is one of the prime historic forces. The final value of his book is not so much in its contributions toward the ultimate portraits of the Confederate leaders as in the stimulating charge of his own hearty conviction that historical portraiture is worth while. At the moment, when history seems to be reacting somewhat against the ultra-economic school, when it seems to be taking a psychological turn, Mr. Bradford may even be thought of as one of the first fruits of a new day. One may risk it that he will be read with pleasure by the late president of the Historical Association. Ought not that to content him for his labor?

N. W. STEPHENSON.

Contemporary American History, 1877-1913. By CHARLES A. BEARD, Associate Professor of Politics, Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. 397.)

THE scope of this book is strictly limited. "I have made no attempt to present an 'artistically balanced' account of the last thirty-five years", says the author, "but have sought rather to furnish a background for the leading issues of current politics and to enlist the interest of the student in the history of the most wonderful period in American development. The book is necessarily somewhat 'impressionistic' and in part it is based upon materials which have not been adequately sifted and evaluated. Nevertheless, I have endeavored to be accurate and fair, and at the same time to invite on the part of the student some of that free-play of the mind which Matthew Arnold has shown to be so helpful in literary criticism."

Despite this apology, we have a right to expect in a supposedly scholarly treatise a more or less balanced treatment of the period, and it is a surprise to find that the author all but neglects economic history. In two chapters, the one on the Growth of Dissent from the Civil War to 1896, the other on the Revival of Dissent after the Spanish War, there is no treatment of the financial panics of 1873, 1893, and 1907. One searches in vain for a consideration of such important subjects as the increase in the supply of gold, the rise of prices, and the slower rise of wages. The development of the West is presented merely as a matter of growth of population and formation of new states, with no discussion of the Indian question, the disposition of the public lands, and the enormous increase in the volume of the crops, and very little on the conservation movement, while for the country at large foreign and domestic commerce, and mining and lumbering, are totally neglected.